

**REMARKS**

Claims herein remain 31-39, and 42-50, all of which have been amended (directly or indirectly) in an effort to more clearly specify the distinctions as treated below. Applicants respectfully request an Advisory Action.

Respectfully, the claims distinguish the Park patent (6,937,588) by clear differences from the reference patent disclosure (35 U.S.C. § 102); also, the distinction being sufficiently strong to support patentability (35 U.S.C. § 103).

Note that Park uses a “sole push over-the-air protocol between the WAP terminal 210a and the push server,” (Park, col. 8, lines 31-32).

Park couples a handheld to a first server, and the first server to a second server, and the second server to a third server. However, no communication is provided between the third server and the first server as specifically stated in the claims, e.g. “--- the third server in wireless communication with both the first server and the second server---” (claim 36).

Thus, the operation stated as a further specific in claim 33 is afforded, i.e., “--- wherein the first server is configured to retrieve the content from the third server---”.

The argument was indicated in a prior amendment (December 16, 2006) “a third server in communication with the first server and with the second server” (amendment, pp. 10, last line).

In view of the above considerations, the capabilities afforded by the distinction, the philosophical operating distinctions, and the present form of the claims, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: May 8, 2009

By:         /Byard G. Nilsson/          
Byard G. Nilsson  
Registration No. 17,350

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810  
Los Angeles, CA 90069  
(310) 247-2860